



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,266	12/29/2000	Christopher Richard Uhlik	15685P063	1475
45222	7590	07/09/2008	EXAMINER	
ARRAYCOMM/BSTZ			MEHRPOUR, NAGHMEH	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY				
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/753,266	Applicant(s) UHLIK ET AL.
	Examiner MELODY MEHRPOUR	Art Unit 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-91 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-91 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No.____/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 6/04/08, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new grounds of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/DWAYNE D. BOST/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2617.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1-6, 15-16, 21-36, 40-46, 55, 57-69, 78, 80-85,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robinson et al. (US Patent Number 5,680,398).

Regarding claims 1, 16, 41, 60, 85, Robinson teaches a method/apparatus of operating a base station comprising:

receiving a random access request for a traffic channel of a plurality of channels on a first random traffic channel of the plurality of traffic channels the traffic channels to be selectively allocated by the base station for communication with a user terminal (col 4 lines 65-67, col 5 lines 1-11, lines 54-67, col 6 lines 1-11); and

determining whether a traffic channel of the plurality of traffic channels is available to allocate to the requestor (col 6 lines 44-56); and

communicating to the requestor whether a channel of the plurality of channels available (col 5 lines 54-67, col 6 lines 1-11).

Regarding claims 2, 42, Robinson teaches a method wherein Communicating includes denying the request for a channel (col 6 lines 11-21). In the even of a collision, the remote unit recognizes that it has not received a channel in response to request (the request denied). Therefore, it delays before making a new request.

Regarding claims 3, 22, 24-25, 43, 61, 83-84, Robinson teaches a method wherein Communicating includes granting the request for a channel by assigning the first channel (col 5 lines 54-67, col 6 lines 1-11).

Regarding claims 4, 23, 27, 44, 58, Robinson teaches a method wherein Communicating includes granting the request for a channel by assigning a second channel and the first channel (col 9 lines 5-45) (col 6 lines 56-67).

Regarding claims 5, 26, 45, Robinson teaches a method wherein communicating includes granting the request for a channel by assigning a second channel instead of the first channel (col 6 lines 56-65).

Regarding claims 6, 46, 59, 69, 82, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor, causing the processor to perform a method, wherein determining includes evaluating a load of the system (col 6 lines 44-55).

Regarding claims 15, 55, 78, Robinson inherently teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor, causing the processor to perform a method further comprising:

receiving a request for a third channel of the plurality of channels upon assigning of the first channel (col 6 lines 44-64);

determining whether a third or fourth channel of the plurality of channels is available (col 6 lines 56-67, col 7 lines 1-11); and communicating to the requestor the third channel availability or fourth channel availability (col 6 lines 56-67, col 7 lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 21, Robinson inherently teaches a method wherein the indication signaling no channel is available (col 6 lines 11-21). In the even of a collision, the remote unit recognizes that it has not received a channel in response to request (the request denied). Therefore, it delays before making a new request.

Regarding claims 28, 30, Robinson teaches a method comprising:

sending a request for a third channel of the plurality of channels;

receiving an indication of availability of a channel of the plurality of channels (col 6 lines 44-67).

Regarding claim 29, Robinson teaches a method comprising:

the indication signaling the third channel is not available. In the even of a collision, the remote unit recognizes that it has not received a channel in response to request (the request denied). Therefore, it delays before making a new request (col 6 lines 12-20).

Regarding claim 31, Robinson teaches a method comprising:

the indication signaling the fourth channel is available (col 6 lines 44-67).

Regarding claim 32, Robinson teaches a method further comprising: waiting an inter-channel delay; sending a request for a third channel of the plurality of channels on the third channel; receiving an indication of availability of a channel of the plurality channels (col 6 lines 44-67).

Regarding claim 33, Robinson teaches a method wherein:

the indication signaling the third channel is not available;

determining no other channels may be requested;

waiting an inter-attempt delay; and

sending a request for the first channel on the first channel. In the even of a collision, the remote unit recognizes that it has not received a channel in response to request (the request denied). Therefore, it delays before making a new request (col 6 lines 12-20, lines 44-67).

Regarding claims 34, 36, Robinson teaches a method of providing access to a network comprising:

receiving a request for access on a first channel of a plurality of channels at random from a network subscriber, each channel of the plurality of channels suitable for

accessing the network, and granting access to the network on a channel of the plurality of channels based on an evaluation of factors (col 5 line 67 col 6 lines 1-11, lines 44-56).

Regarding claims 35, 62, Robinson teaches a method wherein the evaluation factors include subscriber status, subscriber equipment network loading (col 6 lines 44-56).

Regarding claims 40, 57, 80, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor causing the processor to perform a method wherein determining includes evaluating the radio frequency characteristics of the request (col 6 lines 44-56).

Regarding claim 63, Robinson teaches a system comprising:

a processor/controller 211; and a network interface coupled to the processor (any base station contains a processor, see figure 3, col 6 lines 21-41);

wherein the processor and the network interface are collectively configured to: receive a request for a channel of a plurality of channels on a first channel of the plurality of channels (col 5 line 67, col 6 lines 1-11);

determine whether a channel of a plurality of channels is available (col 6 lines 5-45); and

communicate to the requestor whether a channel of the plurality of channels is available (col 5 line 67, col 6 lines 1-11).

Regarding claims 64, Robinson teaches a machine-readable medium (base station is a computer) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor, causing the processor to perform a method the method comprising:

receiving a request for a channel of a plurality of channels on a first channel of the plurality of channels (col 5 line 67, col 6 lines 1-11);

determining whether a channel of the plurality of channels is available; and communicating to the requestor whether a channel of the plurality of channels available (col 5 lines 67, col 6 lines 1-11).

Regarding claims 65, 81, Robinson teaches a machine-readable medium (base station is a computer) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor/controller (see figure 3, numeral 211), causing the processor to perform a method the method comprising:

wherein communicating includes denying the request for a channel (col 6 lines 11-20). In the even of a collision, the remote unit recognizes that it has not received a channel in response to request (the request denied). Therefore, it delays before making a new request.

Regarding claims 66, teaches a machine-readable medium (base station is a computer) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor, causing the processor to perform a method the method comprising:
granting the request for a channel by assigning the first channel (col 5 line 67, col 6 lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 67, Robinson a machine-readable medium (base station is a computer) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor, causing the processor to perform a method the method comprising:

granting the request for a channel by assigning a second channel and the first channel (col 6 lines 44-56).

Regarding claim 68, Robinson inherently teaches a machine-readable medium (base station is a computer) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor, causing the processor to perform a method comprising:

granting the request for a channel by assigning a second channel instead of the first channel (col 6 lines 1-11, 44-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2617

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 7-8, 11, 18, 37, 47-48, 51, 70-71,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. (US Patent Number 5,680,398) in view of Wheeler et al. (US Patent Number 2002/0072348 A1).

Regarding claims 7, 18, 37, 47, 70, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor (see figure 1, 104), causing the processor to perform a method (see figure 1, col 2 lines 66-67, col 3 lines 1-12). Robinson fails to teach a method wherein determining includes evaluating an emergency status of the request. However Wheeler teaches a method wherein determining includes evaluating an emergency status of the request (page 2 sections 0013-0014). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Wheeler with Robinson , in order to enable the user to register automatically in response to the a notification message.

Regarding claims 8, 48, 71, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor (see figure 1, 104), causing the processor to perform a method (see figure 1, col 2 lines 66-67, col 3 lines 1-12). Robinson fails to teach a method wherein determining includes evaluating a status of a subscriber from whom the

request originates subscriber. However Wheeler teaches a method wherein determining includes evaluating a status of a subscriber from whom the request originates subscriber (page 1 section 0008). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Wheeler with Robinson, in order to enable the user to register automatically in response to the a notification message.

Regarding claims 11, 51, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor (see figure 1, 104), causing the processor to perform a method (see figure 1, col 2 lines 66-67, col 3 lines 1-12). Robinson fails to teach a method wherein determining includes evaluating a nature of the request. However Wheeler teaches a method wherein determining includes evaluating a nature of the request (page 1 section 0011). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Wheeler with Robinson, in order to enable the user to register automatically in response to the a notification message.

4. **Claims 9-10, 39, 49-50, 56, 72-73, 79,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. (US Patent Number 5,680,398) in view of Wheeler et al. (US Patent Number 2002/0072348 A1)) in further view of Castanho et al. (US Patent Number 2002/0087740 A1).

Regarding claims 9, 49, 72, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor (see figure 1, 104), causing the processor to perform a method (see figure 1, col 2 lines 66-67, col 3 lines 1-12). Robinson modified by Wheeler fails to teach a method wherein evaluating the status includes evaluating the subscription terms of the subscriber. However Castanho teaches a method wherein evaluating the status includes evaluating the subscription terms of the subscriber (page 2 section 0023). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Castanho with Robinson modified by Wheeler, in order to enable the user to register automatically in response to the a notification message.

Regarding claims 10, 39, 50, 56, 73, 79, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor (see figure 1 104), causing the processor to perform a method (see figure 1, col 2 lines 66-67, col 3 lines 1-12). Robinson modified by Wheeler fails to teach a method wherein evaluating the status includes evaluating the payment history and usage history of the subscriber (page 2 section 0035). However Castanho teaches a method wherein evaluating the status includes evaluating the payment history and usage history of the subscriber. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

above teaching of Castanho with Robinson modified by Wheeler, in order to notify roaming subscribers of suitable providers and their associated tariff rates when operating in an unfamiliar location.

5. **Claims 12-14**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al.(US Patent Number 5,680,398) in view of Wheeler et al. (US Patent Number 2002/0072348 A1)) in further view of Mittal et al. (US Patent Number 2003/0163393A1).

Regarding claim 12, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor (col 9 lines 5-45), causing the processor to perform a method (see figure 1, col 2 lines 66-67, col 3 lines 1-12). Robinson modified by Wheeler fails to teach a method wherein the nature of the request includes a high bandwidth requirement. However Mittal teaches a method wherein the nature of the request includes a high bandwidth requirement (page 6 section 0071, page 9 section 0098). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Mittal with Robinson modified by Wheeler, in order to enable the user to have complete control over the network by obtaining successful interface according to frequency platform.

Regarding claim 13, Robinson inherently teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor causing the processor to perform a method (col 9 lines 5-45). Robinson modified by Wheeler fails to teach a method wherein a nature of the request includes a low bandwidth requirement. However Mittal teaches a method wherein the nature of the request includes a low bandwidth requirement (page 6 section 0071, page 9 section 0099). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Mittal with Robinson modified by Wheeler, in order to enable the user to have complete control over the network by obtaining successful interface according to frequency platform.

Regarding claim 14, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor (see figure 1, 104), causing the processor to perform a method (see figure 1, col 2 lines 66-67, col 3 lines 1-12). Robinson modified by Wheeler fails to teach a method wherein a nature of the request includes a set of capabilities of equipment used to make the request. However Mittal teaches a method wherein the nature of the request includes a high bandwidth requirement (page 4 section 0042, page 6 section 0071). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Mittal with Robinson modified by Wheeler, in order to enable the user to have complete control over the network by obtaining successful interface according to device platform.

6. **Claims 19, 52-54, 74-77,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al.(US Patent Number 5,680,398) in view of Mittal et al. (US Patent Number 2003/0163393A1).

Regarding claim 52, 74-75, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor (col 9 lines 5-45), causing the processor to perform a method (see figure 1, col 2 lines 66-67, col 3 lines 1-12). Robinson fails to teach a method wherein the nature of the request includes a high bandwidth requirement. However Mittal teaches a method wherein the nature of the request includes a high bandwidth requirement (page 6 section 0071, page 9 section 0098). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Mittal with Robinson, in order to enable the user to have complete control over the network by obtaining successful interface according to frequency platform.

Regarding claims 53, 76, Robinson inherently teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor causing the processor to perform a method (col 9 lines 5-45). Robinson fails to teach a method wherein a nature of the request includes a low bandwidth requirement. However Mittal teaches a method wherein the

nature of the request includes a low bandwidth requirement (page 6 section 0071, page 9 section 0099). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Mittal with Robinson, in order to enable the user to have complete control over the network by obtaining successful interface according to frequency platform.

Regarding claims 19, 54, 77, Robinson teaches a method/machine-readable medium (base station is a machine readable medium) embodying instruction, the instructions, when executed by a processor (see figure 1, 104), causing the processor to perform a method (see figure 1, col 2 lines 66-67, col 3 lines 1-12). Robinson fails to teach a method wherein a nature of the request includes a set of capabilities of equipment used to make the request. However Mittal teaches a method wherein the nature of the request includes a high bandwidth requirement (page 4 section 0042, page 6 section 0071). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Mittal with Robinson, in order to enable the user to have complete control over the network by obtaining successful interface according to device platform.

7. **Claims 17, 38,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. (US Patent Number 5,680,398) in view of Miller et al. (US Patent Number 6,006,084).

Regarding claim 17, Robinson fails to teach a method wherein a request including a subscriber/an equipment identification. However Miller teach a method wherein a request including a subscriber/an equipment identification (col 14 lines 44-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Miller with Robinson, in order to enable the service provider to have accurate billing information for individual members.

Regarding claim 38, Robinson fails to teach a method wherein the request includes information related to equipment used by a subscriber making the request. However Miller teach a method wherein a request including a subscriber/equipment identification (col 14 lines 44-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Miller with Robinson, in order to enable the service provider to have accurate billing information for individual members.

8. **Claim 20,** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. (US Patent Number 5,680,398) in view of Barany et al. (US Patent Number 2002/0065081).

Regarding claim 20, Robinson fails to teach a method wherein the request including a training sequence. However Barany teaches a communication system that Mobile request including a training sequence (page section 0071, section 0072). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Barany with Robinson, in order to enable the mobile to use different system with different protocols.

9. **Claims 86-91**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. (US Patent Number 5,687,171), in view of Schein et al. (US Publication Number 2003/0133426).

Regarding claims 86, 88, 90, Robinson fails to teach a method further comprising calculating a set of spatial multiplexing weights and a set of spatial demultiplexing weights associated with the request. However, Schein teaches a method further comprising calculating a set of spatial multiplexing weights and a set of spatial demultiplexing weights associated with the request (page 2 section 0020). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Schein with Robinson, in order to reduce the interference caused by the broadcast channel.

Regarding claims 87, 89, 91, Robinson fails to teach a method wherein communicating to the requestor includes using the set of spatial multiplexing weights to tailor a multi-lobe antenna radiation pattern. However, Schein teaches a method wherein communicating to the requestor includes using the set of spatial multiplexing weights to tailor a multi-lobe antenna radiation pattern (page 2 section 0020) Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Schein with Robinson, in order to reduce the interference caused by the broadcast channel.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-91 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. **Any responses to this action should be mailed to:**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELODY MEHRPOUR whose telephone number is 5(571)272-791313. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached (571) 272-7023.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Naghmeh Mehrpour/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617

June 17, 2008